Existence Is Infinite

Moderators: AMod, iMod

Post Reply | Search this topic… | 731 posts | 1 … 16 17 18 19 20 … 49

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm
>>
>>> Age wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 1:20 pm
>>> Is 'this' WHAT you think I have been talking ABOUT?
>>
>> No, I was simply identifying the fallacy in your particular statement there.
>
> WHERE is the SUPPOSED 'fallacy' in my particular statement here?

The statement referenced with fallacy in bold:

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 11:13 am
>
>> Age wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 10:14 am
>> …While, ALSO, REVEALING that if you ACTUALLY KNEW **what ALL 'things' were constitutionally made up of…**
>
> All things are *all things*. They are not "made up of". They would already be *all things*.
>
> In other words there's no more things than all things.

Again, all things are all things. "All things" implicitly includes constituent parts. Suggesting all things are "made up of" is redundant.

All things would not be "constitutionally made up of", as you state, *as they would already be all things*.

You fallaciously suggest "all things" would be "made up of" additional things or other things or something else.

Or, if you wish, *you* could clarify and explain to readers how all things could be "made up of" or what you really meant by your statement.

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm
>> As you admit here, you were attempting to have me state "immaterial expanse consists of nothing" which would apparently reveal nothing exists.
>
> Well **you have YET to INFORM the 'readers' here 'what' 'immaterial expanse', CONSISTS OF**, CONSTITUTIONALLY MADE UP OF, is COMPOSED OF, or IS 'what', (in relation to ANY other 'terms' or 'words' that you would like to ADD IN here).

I have:

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Sat Jul 01, 2023 7:23 am
> **Immaterial expanse consists of immaterial expanse**. As stated, immaterial expanse is simply immaterial expanse. As with physical material, immaterial expanse can be broken down into or can be measured as smaller units or smaller regions, however it's still immaterial expanse.
>
> One could ask "What does X consist of?" And receive response "Y". One could ask "What does Y consist of?" And receive response "Z". One could ask "What does Z consist of?" and continue down the path of madness. I will not entertain such nonsense here.

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
> And, this IS BECAUSE 'immaterial expanse' does NOT CONSIST OF absolutely ANY 'thing', OBVIOUSLY.
>
> BUT, if you want to KEEP CLAIMING that 'this' is false, wrong, or incorrect, then, PLEASE, by ALL MEANS SHOW and PROVE otherwise.

See above.

As discussed that terminology is redundant. Immaterial expanse is simply immaterial expanse. Immaterial expanse doesn't necessarily "consist of". Immaterial expanse is about as basic as it gets, as stated here:

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Wed Jun 28, 2023 8:59 am
> Immaterial expanse is about as simple, is about as basic as it gets, hence the trouble simplifying or breaking it down further.
>
> Again, you are arguing that an elemental thing is not a thing because it cannot be broken down or simplified further. In essence you are *arguing that a basic thing is not a thing, or is based on nothing or nonexistence, because it cannot be any more basic*. That is a fallacious argument.
>
> Immaterial expanse is a rather basic aspect of existence, but not a nonexistent aspect of existence.

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm
>> Immateriality is not nothing or nonexistence.
>
> BUT, 'you' can NOT tell 'us' what 'immateriality' IS, EXACTLY, HOW 'it' EXISTS, NOR 'what' IS EXISTING, EXACTLY, right?

This has already been discussed: viewtopic.php?p=653291#p653291

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm
>> Immaterial expanse is a thing, not no thing.
>>
>> Nothing, the term, the concept, is a thing, not no thing.
>
> The areas, or expanses, of 'nothing' which DOES, and HAS TO EXIST, for the Universe TO EXIST in the way that It DOES, infinitely AND eternally, IS ALSO A 'thing'. Although you STILL, currently, BELIEVE otherwise.

That areas or expanses are perceived and acknowledged here illustrates they are indeed things *by definition*:

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm
> **Thing (n.)**: An existing, material or immaterial; a part of existence. **That which is perceived or interacted with**, at least in part, in some way. E.g. a word, an object, matter, energy, consciousness, a concept, an event, a process, etc.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm
> **Things have properties**, things have qualities. Stars are bright. Icicles are cold. The automobile is aerodynamic. Nothing or nonexistence, beyond the concept or term, has no properties or qualities as it does not actually exist.

You may disagree however that is how the terms are defined within the philosophy.

Regardless your opinion area or expanse is indeed a thing. By definition.

Apparently you ultimately agree area or expanse is a thing:

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
> The areas, or expanses…IS ALSO A 'thing'

…so nothing still does not exist per your own admission.

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
> The areas, or expanses, of 'nothing' which DOES, and HAS TO EXIST, for the Universe TO EXIST in the way that It DOES, infinitely AND eternally, IS ALSO A 'thing'. Although you STILL, currently, BELIEVE otherwise.

To emphasize these areas, these regions of *immaterial expanse*, not nothing, have qualities. Immaterial expanse has properties. Immaterial expanse is immaterial. Immaterial expanse is voluminous.

Nothingness, nonexistence, nothing has no qualities or properties.

Immaterial expanse can be measured. It can be measured as the area or distance between or among masses or objects (material things) similar to the way other things are measured. Expanse can be measured arbitrarily from one point to another. In the hypothetical case of a single physical object or most-distant object expanse can be measured from that point beyond and considered to be indefinite from that point.

Nothingness, nonexistence, nothing has no extent or capacity to be measured.

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm
>> Every thing is some thing. All that is is existence. Nothing, nonexistence is not and cannot be.
>
> LOL
>
> **Can you REALLY STILL NOT YET SEE your VERY OWN CONTRADICTION here**, ONCE AGAIN?

No, and that is precisely the point.

I don't *see* a contradiction. I see *congruency*.

See "nothing"? *See* the term? I *perceive* it. *You* perceive it. You *typed* it. It is perceived and interacted with. That is, by definition, a thing. Not no thing.

I see no contradiction. I see congruency.

Congruency illustrating existence is infinite as nothing is not and cannot be.

Even the term "nothing" itself is a testament to the prevalence of existence.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

Age
ONLINE
Posts: 26383
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
>
>> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>>
>>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm
>>>
>>> No, I was simply identifying the fallacy in your particular statement there.
>>
>> WHERE is the SUPPOSED 'fallacy' in my particular statement here?
>
> The statement referenced with fallacy in bold:
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 11:13 am
>>
>>> Age wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 10:14 am
>>> …While, ALSO, REVEALING that if you ACTUALLY KNEW **what ALL 'things' were constitutionally made up of…**
>>
>> All things are *all things*. They are not "made up of". They would already be *all things*.

So, to you, ALL 'things' are made up of ALL 'things', right or wrong?

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> In other words there's no more things than all things.

ONCE AGAIN, you are completely and utterly MISUNDERSTANDING here.

BUT, this is JUST NORMAL for one who BELIEVES that they ALREADY KNOW the truth of 'things', like you are SHOWING and EXAMPLING here.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Again, all things are all things. "All things" implicitly includes constituent parts. Suggesting all things are "made up of" is redundant.

AGAIN, if you ALREADY KNEW what ALL 'things' were made up of, EXACTLY, then you would NOT be SAYING 'things' such as and like, 'All things are all things'.

you are sounding like one who CLAIMS to KNOW 'things', BUT, WHEN QUESTIONED just SAYS, 'But that is just the way things are'.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> All things would not be "constitutionally made up of", as you state, *as they would already be all things*.

LOL EVERY 'thing' IS made up of at least two OTHER 'things', EXCEPT, OF COURSE, for the TWO FUNDAMENTAL 'things' of the Universe, Itself.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> You fallaciously suggest "all things" would be "made up of" additional things or other things or something else.

BUT what you call 'my fallacy' is ONLY what you ASSUME I am SAYING, and MEANING, here. However, what I am ACTUALLY ASKING, SAYING, and MEANING is DIFFERENT FROM what you ARE ASSUMING, and/or BELIEVING, here.

I will now suggest TO 'you' what I suggest TO "others", and that IS it is MUCH BETTER if you SEEK OUT, GAIN, and OBTAIN ACTUAL CLARITY, FIRST, BEFORE you ASSUME absolutely ANY 'thing' here.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Or, if you wish, *you* could clarify and explain to readers how all things could be "made up of" or what you really meant by your statement.

YES, I AGREE I COULD DO 'this' here. However, CONSIDERING that absolutely NO one has ASKED me FOR ANY SPECIFIC CLARIFICATION, NOR FOR ANY SPECIFIC EXPLANATION, here, then I WILL CONTINUE TO JUST WAIT.

I am NOT going to EXPLAIN 'things' here if NO is Truly INTERESTED, and, OBVIOUSLY, if one is ALREADY BELIEVING that they KNOW what the truth is here, then they would NOT be Truly INTERESTED in ANY 'thing' DIFFERENT.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
>
>> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>>
>> Well **you have YET to INFORM the 'readers' here 'what' 'immaterial expanse', CONSISTS OF**, CONSTITUTIONALLY MADE UP OF, is COMPOSED OF, or IS 'what', (in relation to ANY other 'terms' or 'words' that you would like to ADD IN here).
>
> I have:
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Sat Jul 01, 2023 7:23 am
>> **Immaterial expanse consists of immaterial expanse**. As stated, immaterial expanse is simply immaterial expanse.

Do 'you' KNOW what 'you' sound like here "daniel j lavender"?

If no, then, to me, you sound JUST LIKE the "preacher" who CLAIMS, 'God created the Universe/everything', but WHEN QUESTIONED, 'But who created God?', and the reply comes back something like; 'It just is what it is', and/or, 'There are somethings that we are just NOT meant TO KNOW'.

So, in other words, what you are essentially SAYING here is like, 'God created the Universe, because God is God and God can create anything. God created the Universe, and there is NOTHING MORE needed to be known'.

Or, as you ARE SAYING here, 'existence consists of an immaterial expanse, because existence could NOT exist without an immaterial expanse and existence is all things. Immaterial expanse is an immaterial expanse, and there is NOTHING MORE needed to be known here.

The CIRCULAR REASONING, with both, IS THE SAME.
The INCONSISTENCIES, within both, are more or less THE SAME. AND,
The CONTRADICTION, itself, IS more or less THE SAME.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> As with physical material, immaterial expanse can be broken down into or can be measured as smaller units or smaller regions, however it's still immaterial expanse.

So what? And, OBVIOUSLY.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> One could ask "What does X consist of?" And receive response "Y".

But WHAT ELSE plus 'Y'?

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> One could ask "What does Y consist of?" And receive response "Z".

But WHAT ELSE plus 'Z'?

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> One could ask "What does Z consist of?" and continue down the path of madness.

LOL Spoken like one who Truly DOES NOT YET KNOW.

AGAIN, 'you' are sounding just like the "preacher" WHEN QUESTIONED and CHALLENGED OVER and ABOUT the CLAIMS 'they' MAKE, ALSO.

I WILL AGAIN SUGGEST that 'you', people, here OBTAIN the ACTUAL IRREFUTABLE Truth of what 'it' is that you want to SAY and CLAIM IS TRUE, BEFORE, you come onto a public forum, especially, and CLAIM that 'it' (whatever) IS TRUE.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> I will not entertain such nonsense here.

Will considering that 'you' are the ONLY one here thinking and SEEING 'things' THIS WAY, then the ONLY one who ENTERTAINED THIS WAY is 'you'' ALONE "daniel j lavender".

AGAIN, I will suggest that you NOT ASSUME some 'thing' BEFORE you START BELIEVING, and thus ENTERTAINING, ANY IDEAS.

LOOK, if you do NOT YET KNOW what the Universe, FUNDAMENTALLY, consists of and is thus made up of, EXACTLY, then to NOT be to concerned NOR worried ABOUT 'this', as NO OTHER human being DID neither, in the days when this was being written.

BUT, WHEN 'you', human beings, do evolve MORE, further along the path, THEN 'you' WILL SEE the ACTUAL Truth of 'things', which I HAVE BEEN ALLUDING TO here.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
>
>> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>> And, this IS BECAUSE 'immaterial expanse' does NOT CONSIST OF absolutely ANY 'thing', OBVIOUSLY.
>>
>> BUT, if you want to KEEP CLAIMING that 'this' is false, wrong, or incorrect, then, PLEASE, by ALL MEANS SHOW and PROVE otherwise.
>
> See above.

LOL

This is YOUR so-called 'reasoning' here "daniel j lavender"; 'immaterial expanse IS immaterial expanse' BECAUSE I SAY 'it' IS.

Which is JUST LIKE the "preacher" so-call 'reasoning'; 'God exists' BECAUSE I SAY 'It' DOES.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> As discussed that terminology is redundant.

ONLY in YOUR OWN MADE UP and BELIEVED 'world' and 'view' of 'things' here.

JUST LIKE ALL 'terminology is redundant' if 'that terminology' does NOT FIT IN WITH ANY one "else's" BELIEFS and/or MADE UP 'world view' of 'things'.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Immaterial expanse is simply immaterial expanse.

JUST LIKE, God is simply God, right?

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Immaterial expanse doesn't necessarily "consist of".

REALLY?

So, are you SAYING, and now CLAIMING, that there ARE 'things', EXISTING, which do NOT necessarily 'consist of' absolutely ANY 'thing'?

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Immaterial expanse is about as basic as it gets, as stated here:
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Wed Jun 28, 2023 8:59 am
>> Immaterial expanse is about as simple, is about as basic as it gets, hence the trouble simplifying or breaking it down further.

Okay. Now, let us LOOK AT 'this' FROM ANOTHER perspective, or IN ANOTHER way.

Existence consists of 'things' and of NO 'things' BECAUSE 'this' is about as simple, and is about as basic as 'it' gets, hence the, IMAGINED, BELIEVED, and self-PROCLAIMED, 'trouble' simplifying or breaking 'it' down further.

If you can NOT EXPLAIN 'it', in an IRREFUTABLE WAY, SIMPLY, then HOW WELL do 'you', REALLY, KNOW 'the subject' here?

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Again, you are arguing that an elemental thing is not a thing because it cannot be broken down or simplified further.

BESIDES 'this' CLAIM here being ANOTHER CLAIMS of 'YOURS', which IS ABSOLUTELY False, Wrong, AND Incorrect, 'this CLAIM' IS ALSO Truly ABSURD and ILLOGICAL, to say the least.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> In essence you are *arguing that a basic thing is not a thing, or is based on nothing or nonexistence, because it cannot be any more basic*.

'This' would be one the MOST IDIOTIC ASSUMPTIONS that I have SEEN here, in this forum, in relation to what I HAVE BEEN SAYING, and MEANING.

By the way, and in case you ARE STILL UNAWARE, what you ARE ASSUMING here could NOT get ANY FURTHER AWAY FROM the ACTUAL Truth of 'things'.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> That is a fallacious argument.

Well, considering that 'that argument' exists in 'that head' ONLY, if 'it' IS 'fallacious', or NOT, is of 'your' MAKING ONLY.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Immaterial expanse is a rather basic aspect of existence, but not a nonexistent aspect of existence.

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm
>> Immateriality is not nothing or nonexistence.
>
> BUT, 'you' can NOT tell 'us' what 'immateriality' IS, EXACTLY, HOW 'it' EXISTS, NOR 'what' IS EXISTING, EXACTLY, right?

This has already been discussed: viewtopic.php?p=653291#p653291[/quote]

As I JUST SAID, 'you' can NOT tell 'us' what 'immateriality' IS, EXACTLY, et cetera, et cetera.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
>
>> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>>
>>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm
>>> Immaterial expanse is a thing, not no thing.
>>>
>>> Nothing, the term, the concept, is a thing, not no thing.
>>
>> The areas, or expanses, of 'nothing' which DOES, and HAS TO EXIST, for the Universe TO EXIST in the way that It DOES, infinitely AND eternally, IS ALSO A 'thing'. Although you STILL, currently, BELIEVE otherwise.
>
> That areas or expanses are perceived and acknowledged here illustrates they are indeed things *by definition*:

GREAT.

'This' IS what I have been SAYING and POINTING OUT here, and I am GLAD that you are now ACKNOWLEDGING 'this' ALSO here.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm
>> **Thing (n.)**: An existing, material or immaterial; a part of existence. **That which is perceived or interacted with**, at least in part, in some way. E.g. a word, an object, matter, energy, consciousness, a concept, an event, a process, etc.
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm
>> **Things have properties**, things have qualities.

BUT, you WILL NOT TELL 'us' what the 'properties' AND 'quality' OF 'immaterial expanse' IS, EXACTLY.

This is BECAUSE you CAN NOT, and you CAN NOT, BECAUSE you do NOT YET KNOW "yourself".

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Stars are bright. Icicles are cold. The automobile is aerodynamic. Nothing or nonexistence, beyond the concept or term, has no properties or qualities as it does not actually exist.

SO, and LAUGHINGLY, ONCE AGAIN, you CLAIM that 'nothing' IS A 'thing', EXISTS, and IS A PART OF 'existence', itself, BUT that 'nothing', or 'nonexistence' does NOT ACTUALLY EXIST.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> You may disagree however that is how the terms are defined within the philosophy.

LOL WITHIN 'whose, so-called, philosophy?

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Regardless your opinion area or expanse is indeed a thing. By definition.

'This' goes WITHOUT SAYING, regardless of YOUR opinion.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Apparently you ultimately agree area or expanse is a thing:

What do you MEAN by 'apparently'?

Is there ABSOLUTELY ANY 'thing' that I have EVER SAID or WRITTEN here that would even SUGGEST otherwise?

If yes, then WHERE and WHEN, EXACTLY?

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
>
>> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>> The areas, or expanses…IS ALSO A 'thing'
>
> …so nothing still does not exist per your own admission.

LOL The MORE you ASSUME 'things' here and the MORE you 'TRY TO' SPEAK FOR me, the MORE WRONG and INCORRECT you ARE.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
>
>> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>> The areas, or expanses, of 'nothing' which DOES, and HAS TO EXIST, for the Universe TO EXIST in the way that It DOES, infinitely AND eternally, IS ALSO A 'thing'. Although you STILL, currently, BELIEVE otherwise.
>
> To emphasize these areas, these regions of *immaterial expanse*, not nothing, have qualities. Immaterial expanse has properties. Immaterial expanse is immaterial. Immaterial expanse is voluminous.

SO, what ARE the, EXACT, QUALITIES and the, EXACT, PROPERTIES OF what you call 'immaterial expanse' here?

1. Is 'voluminous' right?

If yes, then what ELSE, EXACTLY?

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Nothingness, nonexistence, nothing has no qualities or properties.

If you SAY SO.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Immaterial expanse can be measured. It can be measured as the area or distance between or among masses or objects (material things) similar to the way other things are measured.

We ARE getting CLOSER. But it HAS TAKEN QUITE A WHILE.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Expanse can be measured arbitrarily from one point to another. In the hypothetical case of a single physical object or most-distant object expanse can be measured from that point beyond and considered to be indefinite from that point.
>
> Nothingness, nonexistence, nothing has no extent or capacity to be measured.

So, you STILL BELIEVE that 'an area' of 'nothingness' IS AN IMPOSSIBILITY TO EXIST, right?

Either way, BUT, you STILL BELIEVE that 'an area' of 'immaterial expanse' NOT just CAN exist but ACTUALLY DOES EXIST, right?

Either way, AND, you BELIEVE that 'an area' of 'immaterial expanse' IS A 'thing', BUT, 'an area' of 'nothing' can NOT BE A 'thing', right?

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
>
>> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
>>
>>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm
>>> Every thing is some thing. All that is is existence. Nothing, nonexistence is not and cannot be.
>>
>> LOL
>>
>> **Can you REALLY STILL NOT YET SEE your VERY OWN CONTRADICTION here**, ONCE AGAIN?
>
> No, and that is precisely the point.

I don't *see* a contradiction. I see *congruency*.[/quote]

GREAT.

Here we have ANOTHER GREAT example of when one is currently BELIEVING SOME 'thing' IS TRUE, then 'they' are NOT ABLE TO SEE the ACTUAL Truth of 'things'. 'This phenomena' can be CLEARLY SEEN by THE WAY 'this one' PRESENTS 'its' ASSUMPTIONS and BELIEFS here. That is; even when an IRREFUTABLE INCONSISTENCY or CONTRADICTION in what they are SAYING, and CLAIMING, based off of their OWN ASSUMPTION or BELIEF, is ABSOLUTELY BLINDINGLY OBVIOUS TO "others", 'that one' REMAINS COMPLETELY OBLIVIOUS TO the FALLACIES in what 'it' IS SAYING, and CLAIMING, as well as to the ACTUAL Truth of 'things'.

OF COURSE 'you' ONLY SEE 'congruence' here. This IS BECAUSE you have DEFINED 'words' and 'terms' IN A WAY that FIT IN WITH what you HAD ALREADY CONCLUDED, and are now CURRENTLY BELIEVING, IS ABSOLUTELY TRUE here.

you have MADE UP and CREATED these Truly INCONSISTENT, CONTRADICTORY, and INCONGRUENT DEFINITIONS FOR 'words' and 'terms' here BECAUSE you HAD ALREADY a PREEXISTING BELIEF that 'nothing' and 'something' DO NOT EXIST and COULD NOT EVER EXIST.

BUT, TO OVERCOME this Truly CONTRADICTORY and False CLAIM, you MADE UP the 'concept' that 'immaterial expanse' IS A 'thing', and EXISTS, BUT WHILE NEVER BEING ABLE TO EXPLAIN what 'immaterial expanse' is ACTUALLY MADE UP OF 'itself'.

BECAUSE IF you EVER DID, then the CONTRADICTION WOULD BE here for ALL OF 'us' TO LOOK AT and SEE.

SO, you WILL just CONTINUE ON the WAY you HAVE BEEN and ARE here now. BECAUSE to do OTHERWISE would, LITERALLY, BE the DEATH or END of 'you'.

(BUT because 'you' do NOT YET KNOW and UNDERSTAND WHO and WHAT the 'you' IS, EXACTLY, what I just SAID here WOULD BE and IS BEING LOST ON just about ALL of the 'human beings', BACK in the days when this was being written.)

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> *See* "nothing"? *See* the term? I *perceive* it. *You* perceive it. You *typed* it. It is perceived and interacted with. That is, by definition, a thing. Not no thing.
>
> I see no contradiction. I see congruency.

GREAT. KEEP SEEING so-called 'congruency'.

The people WHO BELIEVED the earth revolves around the sun ALSO SAW so-called 'congruency'.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Congruency illustrating existence is infinite as nothing is not and cannot be.

AGAIN, we have ANOTHER PRIME example of one just EXPRESSING what they BELIEVE IS TRUE, BEFORE OBTAIN ANY CLARITY and ACTUAL Facts, FIRST.

> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
> Even the term "nothing" itself is a testament to the prevalence of existence.

SO, ONCE AGAIN, we find 'ourselves'' with even FURTHER PROOF that, ACTUALLY, WITHOUT 'nothing' there IS NO 'Existence', well NOT in the WAY 'Existence' EXISTS NOW, HERE, anyway.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Wizard22** » Fri Jul 21, 2023 9:06 am

Wizard22
Posts: 3344
Joined: Fri Jul 08, 2022 8:16 am

> Age wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 1:35 pm
> BUT there IS A BEGINNING, which is ALSO IRREFUTABLY True.

Really? Where? When?

See, Age, you do have Beliefs after all. Maybe you weren't self-conscious to see them in yourself, but here they are. You believe in "A BEGINNING".

Why?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:14 am

Age
ONLINE
Posts: 26383
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> Wizard22 wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 9:06 am
>
>> Age wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 1:35 pm
>> BUT there IS A BEGINNING, which is ALSO IRREFUTABLY True.
>
> Really? Where? When?

GREAT CLARIFYING QUESTIONS. PITY that they were NOT ASKED from the OPEN perspective, and so the ACTUAL ANSWER PROVIDED WILL BE CLEARLY MISSED and/or MISUNDERSTOOD, by 'you'.

SEE, 'your' BELIEFS here are just being HELD ONTO TO STRONGLY, and so are COMING ACROSS SO OBVIOUS, AS WELL, that to TELL 'you' WHERE and WHEN 'the beginning' IS, EXACTLY, 'you' WILL NOT BE ABLE TO SEE, NOR HEAR, 'IT' as well as be ABLE TO COMPREHEND and UNDERSTAND 'IT'.

As I WILL now SHOW and PROVE.

To ANSWER 'your' OBVIOUSLY VERY CLOSED QUESTIONING here.

1. YES, there REALLY IS A BEGINNING.

2. WHERE THE BEGINNING IS, IS HERE.

3. WHEN THE BEGINNING IS, IS NOW.

ALWAYS HAS BEEN, ALWAYS WILL BE, and ALWAYS IS 'The BEGINNING' HERE, NOW.

> Wizard22 wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 9:06 am
> See, Age, you do have Beliefs after all. Maybe you weren't self-conscious to see them in yourself, but here they are. You believe in "A BEGINNING".

LOL 'you' are like A PRIME 'subject' FOR me here is SHOWING and PROVING just how STUPID and RIDICULOUS BELIEFS and/or ASSUMPTIONS can MAKE one REALLY BECOME, and BE.

1. you ASK A QUESTION, or three, here, do NOT WAIT for MY RESPONSE, proceed to CARRY ON as though you KNOW what THE ANSWER/S is/are, and then CLAIM that 'this' is some sort of PROOF that I HAVE some sort of BELIEF here. Which is even MORE STUPID and MORE FOOLISH when I put 'this' IN WRITING then 'it' WAS when I READ what you WROTE here.

2. HOW does just writing, what I DID above here somehow MEAN, IRREFUTABLY, that I DO HAVE 'Beliefs', (capital 'B'), after all? (I CAN and WILL SHOW just how Truly ABSURD and RIDICULOUS 'this statement' AND 'CLAIM' IS, AFTER 'you' PROVIDE 'us' WITH 'your' REASONING for HOW and WHY what I WROTE MEANS, TO 'you', that I now have A 'Belief', after all.

3. 'you' are NOT even REMOTELY CLOSE to BEING 'self-aware' and/or 'self-conscious' ENOUGH to even BEGIN TO RECOGNIZE, SEE, and UNDERSTAND HOW, and WHY, I have being USING 'you' to SHOW and PROVE what I AM here, now. Let alone 'you' CLAIMING what 'you' ARE here ABOUT 'me' NOT being ABLE TO SEE that 'I' have 'Beliefs'.

'you' ARE SO FAR FROM what IS ACTUALLY GOING ON here that even I am somewhat SURPRISED that people like 'you' were STILL existing, in the days when this was being written.

> Wizard22 wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 9:06 am
>
> Why?

WHY 'what'?

WHY do I, supposedly, have 'Beliefs'?

WHY do I, supposedly, have 'Beliefs', which I was, supposedly, 'unconscious' of before?

WHY do I, supposedly, 'Believe' in 'a beginning'?

Or, are you ASKING me WHY? in regards to some 'thing' ELSE?

If it is the latter, then WHY 'what', EXACTLY?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Wizard22** » Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am

Wizard22
Posts: 3344
Joined: Fri Jul 08, 2022 8:16 am

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:14 am
> 1. YES, there REALLY IS A BEGINNING.
>
> 2. WHERE THE BEGINNING IS, IS HERE.
>
> 3. WHEN THE BEGINNING IS, IS NOW.
>
> ALWAYS HAS BEEN, ALWAYS WILL BE, and ALWAYS IS 'The BEGINNING' HERE, NOW.

I disagree.

But see, Age, you are entitled to your beliefs. And I am entitled to mine. You should dwell on your beliefs, after denying you have beliefs at all previously. You're becoming self-conscious ever so slightly. I consider that an improvement, good job!

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:46 am

Age
ONLINE
Posts: 26383
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> Wizard22 wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am
>
>> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:14 am
>> 1. YES, there REALLY IS A BEGINNING.
>>
>> 2. WHERE THE BEGINNING IS, IS HERE.
>>
>> 3. WHEN THE BEGINNING IS, IS NOW.
>>
>> ALWAYS HAS BEEN, ALWAYS WILL BE, and ALWAYS IS 'The BEGINNING' HERE, NOW.
>
> I disagree.

BY ALL MEANS PLEASE DO.

BUT 'this' WAS BLATANTLY OBVIOUS, ALREADY.

> Wizard22 wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am
> But see, Age, you are entitled to your beliefs.

Okay. THANK 'you' FOR LETTING 'me' KNOW what 'I' AM ENTITLED TO here.

Which, by the way, I do NOT AGREE that 'you', human beings, are ENTITLED TO your OWN BELIEFS, like MOST, if NOT ALL, of 'you', adult human beings, have 'GROWN UP' to BELIEVE, IS TRUE.

AND, just like I can PROVE, IRREFUTABLY, what I SAID and CLAIMED PREVIOUSLY here I can ALSO PROVE, IRREFUTABLY, what I ALLUDED TO here, AS WELL. AND, just AS SIMPLY and AS EASILY.

That IS; FOR ANY one who is Truly INTERESTED.

> Wizard22 wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am
> And I am entitled to mine.

LOL So, 'you' BELIEVE that 'you' ARE ABSOLUTELY ENTITLED TO ANY and ALL OF 'your' BELIEFS, right?

> Wizard22 wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am
> You should dwell on your beliefs, after denying you have beliefs at all previously.

Did you WANT TO MAKE 'this' DISCUSSION ABOUT 'your' CLAIM, and BELIEF, that 'I' have BELIEFS here? Or, do you WANT TO MAKE 'this' DISCUSSION ABOUT
'your' CLAIM, and BELIEF, that there is NO 'beginning'?

Either way I AM HAPPY.

ALSO, what 'you' just WROTE here appears, well to me anyway, a Truly WEIRD and STUPID 'thing' to SAY.

WHY 'should' I 'dwell' on 'my beliefs', which you OBVIOUS BELIEVE ABSOLUTELY that I have? AND, HOW, EXACTLY, would or does one 'dwell' ON 'their beliefs'?

> Wizard22 wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am
> You're becoming self-conscious ever so slightly.

WHY?

I STILL DO NOT HAVE the 'Beliefs', which 'you' BELIEVE that I have.

> Wizard22 wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am
> I consider that an improvement, good job!

LOL Even 'this' 'you' got ABSOLUTELY and TOTALLY Wrong AND Incorrect AS WELL.

Here we have A PRIME example of just HOW MUCH INFLUENCE BELIEFS HAD ON the people, back then.

This one here, LAUGHINGLY, ACTUALLY STARTED TO BELIEVE that I was, somehow, COMING TO SEE and RECOGNIZE I HAD A BELIEF, which I NEVER EVEN STARTED TO ASSUME I HAD, let alone SAW OR RECOGNIZED I HAD.

I KNOW the 'thoughts' WITHIN 'this body', AND there IS NOT A one, which BELIEVES what "wizard22" IS ASSUMING and BELIEVING here. Although "wizard22" is NOT ABLE TO SEE and RECOGNIZE 'this', at the moment, BECAUSE, ONCE AGAIN, 'it' IS BELIEVING some 'thing' otherwise.

Also, and by the way, "wizard22", is the ONLY response 'you' are going to COME BACK WITH, AFTER I SHOWED 'you' WHERE and WHEN 'the beginning' IS, EXACTLY, is; 'I disagree'?

I KNOW I SAID, that 'you' WOULD MISS and/or MISUNDERSTAND MY ANSWER, BUT I 'thought' that 'you' would, AT LEAST, 'try to' PROVE me WRONG here.

The BELIEFS, within that body, REALLY ARE AS STRONG as I SAID and CLAIMED, BEFORE, and REALLY DID BLOCK 'you' FROM being ABLE TO COMPREHEND and UNDERSTAND MY ANSWER as I SUGGESTED and CLAIM, AS WELL.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 11:13 am
>>
>>> Age wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 10:14 am
>>> …While, ALSO, REVEALING that if you ACTUALLY KNEW **what ALL 'things' were constitutionally made up of…**
>>
>> All things are *all things*. They are not "made up of". They would already be *all things*.
>
> So, to you, ALL 'things' are made up of ALL 'things', right or wrong?

All things *are* all things.

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
>> Again, all things are all things. "All things" implicitly includes constituent parts. Suggesting all things are "made up of" is redundant.
>
> AGAIN, if you ALREADY KNEW what ALL 'things' were made up of, EXACTLY, then you would NOT be SAYING 'things' such as and like, 'All things are all things'.

Once again, "all things are made up of" is a fallacious statement.

"All things are all things" is not a fallacious statement.

> Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am
>
>> daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
>> All things would not be "constitutionally made up of", as you state, *as they would already be all things*.
>
> LOL **EVERY 'thing' IS made up of at least two OTHER 'things', EXCEPT**, OF COURSE, for the TWO FUNDAMENTAL 'things' of the Universe, Itself.